

REMARKS

In the final Office Action dated July 28, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 28-33, 37-41, 43-51, 54-59, 61-64, 71-73, 75, and 76 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,757,729 to Devarakonda et al. ("*Devarakonda*"); rejected claims 34-36, 42, 52, 53, 60, 65-70, 74, and 78-89 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over *Devarakonda* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,675,804 to Sidik et al. ("*Sidik*"); and rejected claim 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Devarakonda* in view of *Sidik* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,435 to Pino ("*Pino*").

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections presented in the final Office Action.

I. The Rejection of Claims 28-33, 37-41, 43-51, 54-59, 61-64, 71-73, 75, and 76 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner asserts *Devarakonda* discloses each and every recitation of claim 28 (Office Action at p. 2). Claim 28, however, recites:

A method in a data processing system for accessing network services associated with a lookup service, comprising the steps of:
receiving a request from a client by the lookup service for access to one of the network services, the client being remote with respect to the lookup service;
returning, by the lookup service, a resource locator to the client, the resource locator including data for dynamically loading executable code for accessing the one network service; and
providing, by a second network service that is initially inaccessible through the lookup service, information to the lookup service to enable the second network service to be accessible through the lookup service.

The Examiner alleges *Devarakonda* teaches "returning, by the lookup service, a resource locator to the client, the resource locator including data for dynamically loading executable code for accessing the one network service" (Office Action at p. 2), citing

col. 4, lines 12-65 to show a print stub, fax stub, mail stub, VEM/VES, and APs/applets.

However, neither this portion, nor any other portion of *Devarakonda* supports the Examiner's assertion.

First, although *Devarakonda* discloses applets, the reference is silent as to the source of these APs/applets that are transferred over the network. Thus, the APs/applets disclosed by *Devarakonda* cannot correspond to the resource locator returned to the client from a lookup service. Regarding the stubs, VEM, and VES, *Devarakonda* states:

“[e]ach Network Computer includes a Virtual Environment Manager (VEM) 108(1), 108(2) that is downloaded from a service provider” (emphasis added) (*Devarakonda* col. 2, lines 41-43);

“a Web Browser ... executes on the network computer ... the browser downloads the VES ... from a service provider” (emphasis added) (*Devarakonda* col. 3, lines 6-13);

“[a] VES object 414 ... contains ... stub objects 416” (*Devarakonda* col. 4, lines 21-22).

That is, the network computer downloads both the VEM and the VES from a service provider, with the VES containing the stubs. Even if the stubs, VEM, and VES in *Devarakonda* correspond to the claimed resource locator, the service provider corresponds to the claimed network service, and the network computer corresponds to the client (a position Applicants do not concede), the claimed resource locator is returned to the client by the lookup service, not the network service. In *Devarakonda*, the remaining network structure; i.e., SDM 102 does not send any of the stubs, VEM, or VES to the network computer, and thus cannot correspond to the claimed lookup service, as recited in claim 28.

Further, Fig. 4 of *Devarakonda* shows the stubs located at both the service provider and the network computer, but not at the service directory manager. Moreover, when describing the AP, VEM, VES, and stubs in context with the service directory manager, *Devarakonda* teaches only that “the stub is downloaded,” without mentioning the source of the download (*Devarakonda* col. 4, lines 60-65). Nowhere does *Devarakonda* show that the stub is downloaded from the service directory manager. *Devarakonda*, therefore, does not teach or suggest “returning, by the lookup service, a resource locator to the client, the resource locator including data for dynamically loading executable code for accessing the one network service,” as recited in claim 28.

Because *Devarakonda* fails to teach at each and every limitation of claim 28, *Devarakonda* cannot anticipate claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow claim 28. Further, independent claims 37, 44-46, 55, 62, 71, and 75 include recitations similar to that recited in claim 28. As explained, *Devarakonda* does not support the rejection of claim 28. Accordingly, the applied art also does not support the rejection of claims 37, 44-46, 55, 62, 71, and 75 for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 28. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 28, 37, 44-46, 55, 62, 71, and 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 29-33 depend from claim 28, claims 38-41 and 43 depend from claim 37, claims 47-51 and 54 depend from claim 46, claims 56-59 and 61 depend from claim 55, claims 63 and 64 depend from claim 62, claims 72 and 73 depend from claim 71, and claim 76 depends from claim 75. As explained, *Devarakonda* does not support the rejection of claims 28, 37, 46, 55, 62, 71, and 75. Accordingly, the applied art does not

support the rejection of their respective dependent claims for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with the above listed independent claims. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

I. The Rejections of Claims 62, 71, and 75 are Legally Deficient Because the Examiner does not Address the Recitations of these Claims

The Examiner rejects claims 62 and 71 for the same reasons set forth for claim 28 (Office Action at p. 2). Claim 62 and 71, however, include recitations not found in claim 71, such as “the executable code is configured to store data obtained from the one network service for subsequent use.” Accordingly, by relying solely on the rejection of claim 28 to reject claims 62 and 71, the Examiner has failed to establish that *Devarakonda* anticipates the claimed invention. Moreover, *Devarakonda* at least does not teach the claimed “executable code.”

Similarly, the Examiner has improperly failed to address the recitations of claim 75, by relying on the allegations used to reject claim 28 (Office Action at p. 2). Claim 75, however, recites “returning a service stub associated with the identified service to the client, wherein the service stub is embedded in executable code configured to store data obtained from the one network service for subsequent access by the client.” The Examiner does not address this recitation and *Devarakonda* not teach it. Further, the Examiner fails to allege, and *Devarakonda* fails to disclose, “loading the service stub into an address space of the client to render the service stub available for use to invoke the identified service” as recited by claim 75. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 62, 71 and 75 and their dependent claims are legally deficient and should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

III. The Rejection of Claims 34-36, 42, 52, 53, 60, 65-70, 74, and 78-89 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

As explained above, *Devarakonda* does not support the rejection of independent claims 28, 37, 46, 55, 62, 71, and 75. As independent claims 78, 80, 81, 85, and 89 include recitations similar to those recited in claim 28, *Devarakonda* also fails to support the rejection of these claims. Claims 34-36 depend from claim 28, claim 42 depends from claim 37, claims 52 and 53 depend from claim 46, claim 60 depends from claim 55, claims 65-70 depend from claim 62, claim 74 depends from claim 71, claim 79 depends from claim 78, claims 82-84 depend from claim 81, and claims 86-88 depend from claim 85. Accordingly, the reference does not support the rejection of claims 34-36, 42, 52, 53, 60, 65-70, 74, and 78-89 for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 28.

Sidik fails to cure the deficiencies of *Devarakonda*. *Sidik* discloses a procedure for “the invocation of an interpretive procedure by a compiled computer program” (*Sidik* col. 1, lines 32-34). *Sidik*, however, does not disclose “returning, by the lookup service, a resource locator to the client, the resource locator including data for dynamically loading executable code for accessing the one network service.” Because the applied art does not support the rejection of claims 34-36, 42, 52, 53, 60, 65-70, 74, and 78-89, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

III. The Rejection of Claim 77 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 77 depends from claim 75. As explained, *Devarakonda* and *Sidik*, alone or in combination, do not support the rejection of claim 75. Accordingly, the references

do not support the rejection of claim 77 for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 28.

Pino fails to cure the deficiencies of *Devarakonda* and *Sidik*. While *Pino* discloses a "switch service management system architecture" (*Pino* col. 2, lines 15-16), it does not disclose "returning, by the lookup service, a resource locator to the client, the resource locator including data for dynamically loading executable code for accessing the one network service," as recited in claim 77. Because the applied art does not support the rejection of dependent claim 77, the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that claims 28-89 are neither anticipated or obvious in view of the applied art. Applicants therefore request reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.



Dated: October 27, 2006

By: Reg. No. 34,731
for Joseph E. Palys
Reg. No. 46,508